



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR        | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,629   | 12/12/2003  | Eric S. Koopferstock        | 064731.0394         | 2016             |
| 5073 7590 01/15/2009<br>BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.<br>2001 ROSS AVENUE<br>SUITE 600<br>DALLAS, TX 75201-2980 |             |                             |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER<br>CURS, NATHAN M   |             |                             |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT<br>2613   |             | PAPER NUMBER                |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE<br>01/15/2009  |             | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/734,629

**Applicant(s)**

KOOPFERSTOCK, ERIC S.

**Examiner**

NATHAN M. CURS

**Art Unit**

2613

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-13 and 15-19.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/NATHAN M CURS/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2613

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the rejections under 35 USC § 103, Applicant argues that Yoshizawa teaches away from implementing Yoshizawa's separate add and drop elements (fig. 2A elements 41 and 42) as separate add and drop card-pack modules, based on a rationale that such implementation would render Yoshizawa's invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Applicant cites one of Yoshizawa's implicit inventive steps as Yoshizawa's intended purpose, to "replace a 2 x 2 switch with a 2 x 1 switch on an optical add/drop multiplexer component [Applicant's language]", based on paragraphs 0003-0004. Applicant then infers from this that the card-pack module modification of the combination would render "no need for the invention of Yoshizawa "since the switches would be replaceable without complexity and high cost". Applicant's reasoning is not persuasive. First, Applicant's view that elements 41 and 42 are physically "on" an add/drop multiplexer "component" is a misinterpretation of Yoshizawa; Yoshizawa's elements 41 and 42 are separate components of the OADM itself, but they are not taught as being "on" anything, or otherwise physically unitary with other components. Second, Yoshizawa's intended purpose is more broadly to provide a reliable, low cost OADM without using 2 x 2 switches (paragraph 0004, first sentence), and has no correlation with the idea that separate cards are replaceable without complexity and high cost. Whether components of the OADM are implemented as card-pack modules or not is simply irrelevant to Yoshizawa's intended purpose. For example, after implementing the 2 x 1 switch of the OADM as a card-pack module, it is still functionally and operably a 2 x 1 switch, and maintains what Yoshizawa wants; namely, an OADM that uses a 2 x 1 switch instead of a 2 x 2 switch. Further, when the card-pack modules are implemented as described in the combination, the overall operability of the OADM is simply unaffected. Yoshizawa's intended purpose is maintained regardless of the separate card-pack modules.